

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed March 10, 2003. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 14 are amended to more clearly recite features of the claimed invention, and new claims 29-45 are added. Claims 1-45 remain pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Allowed Claims

The Examiner indicated that claims 18-28 were allowed. None of these claims is amended herein, so they continue to be allowed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 14 and 15 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 5,923,017 to Bjorner et al ("Bjorner"). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element, as set forth in the claim, is found in a single prior-art reference. MPEP § 2131; *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). As further explained below, Bjorner cannot anticipate these claims because it does not disclose every element and limitation recited therein.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method combination including, among other things, "capturing multiple images of at least a portion of a surface of the component in response to the trigger signal, the multiple images comprising a series of images including a first two-dimensional image and at least one subsequent two-dimensional image." Bjorner does not disclose, teach or suggest a method including such a limitation. Therefore, Applicants submit that Bjorner cannot anticipate claim 1, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Regarding claims 2-3, if an independent claim is allowable then any claim depending therefrom is also allowable. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Applicants thus submit that claims 2-3 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 1 and by virtue of the features

recited therein. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of these claims.

Claim 14, as amended, recites an apparatus combination including, among other things, “an image sensor configured to capture multiple images of at least a portion of a surface of a component in response to a trigger signal in an automated identification system, the multiple images comprising a series of images including a first two-dimensional image and at least one subsequent two-dimensional image.” Bjorner does not disclose, teach or suggest an apparatus including such a limitation. Therefore, Applicants submit that Bjorner cannot anticipate claim 14, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Regarding claim 15, if an independent claim is allowable then any claim depending therefrom is also allowable. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 14 is in condition for allowance. Applicants thus submit that claim 15 is allowable by virtue of its dependence on allowable claim 14 and by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claim.

New claim 29 recites a method combination including, among other things, “capturing multiple two-dimensional images of at least a portion of a surface of the component in response to the trigger signal, the multiple two-dimensional images comprising a series of images including a first image and at least one subsequent image.” Bjorner does not disclose, teach or suggest a method including such a limitation. Therefore, Applicants submit that Bjorner cannot anticipate claim 29, and respectfully request allowance of the claim.

Regarding claims 30-41, if an independent claim is allowable then any claim depending therefrom is also allowable. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 29 is in condition for allowance. Applicants thus submit that claims 30-41 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 29 and by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicants therefore respectfully request allowance of the claims.

New claim 42 recites an apparatus combination including, among other things, “an image sensor configured to capture multiple two-dimensional images of at least a portion of a surface of a component in response to a trigger signal in an automated identification system, the multiple two-dimensional images comprising a series of images including a first image and at least one

subsequent image.” Bjorner does not disclose, teach or suggest an apparatus including such a limitation. Therefore, Applicants submit that Bjorner cannot anticipate claim 42, and respectfully request allowance of the claim.

Regarding claims 43-45, if an independent claim is allowable then any claim depending therefrom is also allowable. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 42 is in condition for allowance. Applicants thus submit that claims 43-45 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 42 and by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicants therefore respectfully request allowance of the claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 4-9 and 16 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as obvious in view of, and therefore unpatentable over, Bjorner in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,770,841 to Moed et al (“Moed”). In addition, the Examiner rejected claim 17 under § 103 (a) as obvious in view of, and therefore unpatentable over, Bjorner in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,689,490 to Thomas et al (“Thomas”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejections. If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claims 1 and 14, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 4-9 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 1 and by virtue of the features recited therein. Similarly, claims 16 and 17 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 14 and by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of these claims.

Conclusion

Overall, none of the references singly or in any motivated combination disclose, teach, or suggest what is recited in the independent claims. Thus, given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, all independent claims are now in condition for allowance. The dependent claims that depend directly or indirectly on these independent claims are likewise allowable based on at least the same reasons and based on the recitations contained in each dependent claim.

If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a teaching in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such teaching may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (206) 292-8600.

Charge Deposit Account

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 5-29-03



Todd M. Becker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 43,487

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles CA 90025-1030
Phone: 206-292-8600
Facsimile: 206-292-8606

Enclosures: Postcard

APPENDIX A – CLAIMS

MARKED-UP REPLACEMENT CLAIMS

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(c), the amended claims shown below in marked-up form correspond to the clean claims found in the amendment.

1. (Amended) A method, comprising:

receiving a trigger signal communicated from a triggering device in response to a location of a component in an automated identification system;

capturing multiple images of at least a portion of a surface of the component in response to the trigger signal, the multiple images comprising a series of images including a first two-dimensional image and at least one subsequent two-dimensional image; and

processing the multiple images to identify and read a symbol code, if any, contained within at least one or a combination of two or more of the multiple images.

4. (Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising transmitting an output to a coupled display to enable generation of a visual rendering of the first two-dimensional image or the at least one subsequent two-dimensional image on the display.

5. (Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein a user-specified delay precedes capturing the first two-dimensional image, the user-specified delay having a defined duration.

14. (Amended) An apparatus, comprising:

an image sensor configured to capture multiple images of at least a portion of a surface of a component in response to a trigger signal in an automated identification system, the multiple images comprising a series of images including a first two-dimensional image and at least one subsequent two-dimensional image;

a memory, coupled to the image sensor, to store the multiple images;

a processor, coupled to the memory, to process the multiple images to identify and read a symbol code, if any, contained within at least one or a combination of two or more of the multiple images; and

an input/output interface, coupled to the processor, to receive the trigger signal.